

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The application has been amended in response to the April 5, 2004 Office Action in order more clearly describe the present inventions. The pending and amended claims overcome the rejections of claims 1-23 based on the applied references. No new matter has been added.

PENDING REJECTIONS AND OBJECTIONS

The Abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it recites "An reporting system," rather than "A reporting system."

Claims 7, 14, 20 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language.

Claims 1, 8 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because none of the independent claims in conjunction with all dependent claims are statutory.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10, 10-12, 17-18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,571,236 issued to Ruppelt.

Claims 2, 6-7, 9, 13-14, 16, 19-20 and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruppelt.

OBJECTION TO THE ABSTRACT

Applicants have amended the Abstract as suggested. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Applicants have amended claims 7, 14, 20 and 23 to overcome the pending §112, second paragraph rejections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the pending rejections be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Applicants have amended claims 1, 8 and 21 to clarify that the claimed systems and methods are performed using a computer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the pending rejections be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Although Applicants disagree with the propriety of the rejections proposed by the Office Action for claims 1-23, Applicants have nevertheless amended the claims to clarify distinctions between the claims and the prior art of record. Specifically, independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 21 have each been amended to recite that the “the prompt object [] define[s] some or every aspect of a report definition.” Claim 8, a method claim, has also been amended to recite the step and function of “selecting a stored resolution object comprising answers to a question of the prompt object, the stored resolution object having been stored prior to execution of the report.” Claim 15, a system claims, has also been amended to recite “code for causing a processor to enable a user to select a stored resolution object comprising answers to a question of the prompt object, the stored resolution object having been stored prior to execution of the report.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Ruppelt does not teach or suggest a prompt object that “defines some or every part of a report,” as recited in amended claims 1, 8, 15 and 21. In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that Ruppelt is not analogous art to the claimed systems and

methods because it relates to a “method for problem diagnosis based on queries received from remote locations.” *See*, Abstract. The method includes the steps of “determining applicable solution recommendations based on a diagnosis query, displaying the applicable solution recommendations on a screen of a remote terminal, and determining whether a case based reasoning tool is available to answer the diagnosis query.” *Id.* The claimed inventions, on the other hand, relate to prompt objects that form some or every part of a report definition, and thus amount to much more than the query-based solution system disclosed by Ruppelt.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Ruppelt does not teach or suggest a stored resolution object: (1) “for collecting an answer to a question” or “comprising answers to a question,” and (2) that was “stored prior to execution of the report,” as recited in claims 1, 8, 15, and 21. The portions referenced by the Examiner as purportedly teaching this feature do not teach or suggest a stored resolution object, much less a stored resolution object that was stored prior to execution of the report, as recited in claims 1, 8, 15 and 21. Rather, those portions of Ruppelt merely teach an embodiment of a system that extracts keywords from an incoming query and matches them against a database to determine applicable solution recommendations. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that Ruppelt cannot be said to teach or suggest stored resolution objects that are “stored prior to execution of the report.”

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the above amendments and remarks regarding the rejections under §102(e), claims 1, 8, 15 and 21 are now allowable over the cited prior art.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending rejections under §103 are overcome by the amendments and arguments presented above. Accordingly, in view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 8, 15 and 21 are allowed over the art of record. Each remaining claim depends from either independent claim 1, 8, 15 or 21 and is therefore allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

Since the cited references, taken either singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the combinations set forth in the pending claims, and further fail to provide any motivation or suggestion of the desirability of modifying the structures or methods to arrive at the claimed combinations, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejections, allow the pending claims and pass the application to issue.


If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference or interview would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the undersigned stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 or §1.117 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS, LLP

Dated: September 7, 2004
Hunton & Williams, LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)

By: 
Brian M. Buroker
Registration No. 39,125